

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

By this amendment, claims 1-5, 8 and 15 are amended. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action dated October 20, 2009, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Aiyama (U.S. Patent No. 7,075,666, hereinafter "Aiyama") in view of Berson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,938,154, hereinafter "Berson") and further in view of Mori (U.S. Patent No. 6,338,048, hereinafter "Mori"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to Applicants' exemplary embodiments, a printer receives JOB data that includes electronic money data and print data, as illustrated in Fig. 3 of the present application. The electronic money data includes information on an amount of electronic money issued by an electronic money issuer. The issued electronic money has been determined to be exchangeable with actual currency before the printer receives the electronic money data (see publication of the present application: paragraphs 0033-0037).

Once the printer receives JOB data, the printer stores the print data, and transmits a part or all of the electronic money data to the electronic money issuer to check whether the electronic money is valid (see publication of the present application: paragraph 0037). The electronic money issuer checks whether the electronic money is valid, and transmits the result of the check of validity of the

electronic money to the printer (see publication of the present application: paragraph 0038). When the electronic money is valid, the printer executes print processing based on the stored print data (see publication of the present application: paragraph 0039).

It is asserted in the October 20, 2009 Office Action that the credit card number disclosed in col. 7, lines 1-5 and electronic money as disclosed in col. 8, lines 4-7, of Aiyama, correspond to electronic money data as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

To further bring out distinguishing features of claim 1, the claim is amended for clarification to recite "before sending electronic money data on an amount of electronic money for payment of information processing of processing data to a processing system, issuing, by an electronic money issuer, an amount of electronic money for information processing of the processing data and determining that the amount of the issued money is exchangeable with actual currency by a payment institution."

Aiyama does not disclose the above-recited features of claim 1. Aiyama discloses a charge collector that receives a credit card number from an image formation apparatus, and determines whether the credit card number is valid. See col. 7, lines 1-3. If it is valid, the charge collector responds with a print permission. See col. 7, lines 3-4. If it is not valid, the charge collector responds with a print refusal. See col. 7, lines 4-5. Aiyama discloses that the charge collection is not limited by the method of using a credit card, and that an electronic money system can be used. See col. 8, lines 4-7.

The credit card number received at the charge collector in Aiyama cannot be considered as corresponding to the claimed electronic money data received at the

processing system. According to claim 1, the method includes, inter alia, before sending electronic money data on an amount of electronic money for payment of information processing of processing data to a processing system, issuing, by an electronic money issuer, an amount of electronic money for information processing of the processing data and determining that the amount of the issued money is exchangeable with actual currency by a payment institution. In contrast, in Aiyama, the credit card number submitted to the charge collection is merely an account number. Such credit card number as disclosed in Aiyama has not been determined to be exchangeable with actual currency by a payment institution before the credit card number is received at the printer. Therefore, the credit card number received at the charge collector in Aiyama does not correspond to the claimed electronic money data received at the processing system.

Aiyama touches upon the topic of electronic money by disclosing that the charge collection can be an electronic money system. However, Aiyama does not disclose any detail of the electronic money system. Specifically, Aiyama does not disclose that electronic money used has been determined to be exchangeable with actual currency by a payment institution before data on the electronic money data is received at the printer.

Therefore, Aiyama does not disclose an information processing method comprising "before sending electronic money data on an amount of electronic money for payment of information processing of processing data to a processing system, issuing, by an electronic money issuer, an amount of electronic money for information processing of the processing data and determining that the amount of

the issued money is exchangeable with actual currency by a payment institution," as recited in claim 1.

Neither Berson nor Mori remedies the above-noted deficiencies of Aiyama. Berson discloses a printer that is capable of engaging in electronic cash protocols, and could accept digital cash along with a document over the network to pay for print services. However, Berson is devoid of any detail of the digital cash system and the digital cash.

Mori discloses an electronic transaction system for carrying out transaction settlements using electronic money stored on a customer card that is inserted into a card handling unit. Mori does not disclose that the electronic money data is received at the processing system, as described in claim 1. Therefore, the disclosure of the electronic money, which is used on a customer card, is not applicable for the claimed electronic money data, which is used without a customer card.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 is patentable. Claims 2-14 and 16-19 contain distinguishing features that are similar to those of claim 1, and are, therefore, patentable for reasons similar to those for claim 1.

Claim 15 recites an information processing method comprising:

- receiving at a processing system, through a network, job data including processing data to be information-processed and electronic money data of an electronic money issuer including an amount of issued electronic money for payment for information processing of said processing data and information on the electronic money issuer;

- separating, by said processing system, the processing data and the electronic money data;

- transmitting, at said processing system, a part or all of the electronic money data to the electronic money issuer for determining whether the amount of the issued electronic money data is valid; and

- when the amount of the issued electronic money is confirmed to be valid, automatically starting the processing of the

processing data to be information-processed at said processing system.

Berson is relied upon for allegedly disclosing that print data and electronic money data are attached. Berson discloses a printer that is capable of engaging in electronic cash protocols, and could accept digital cash along with a document over the network.

Berson, however, does not disclose details of how the digital cash is processed. Accordingly, Berson does not disclose separating the processing data and the electronic money data. Furthermore, Berson does not disclose transmitting a part or all of the electronic money data to the electronic money issuer for determining whether the amount of the issued electronic money data is valid.

As mentioned above, Aiyama touches upon the topic of electronic money by disclosing that the charge collection can be an electronic money system. However, Aiyama does not disclose any detail of the electronic money system. Therefore, Aiyama does not remedy the deficiencies of Berson.

As mentioned above, Mori does not disclose that the electronic money data is received at the processing system. Therefore, Mori does not disclose separating the processing data and the electronic money data. Furthermore, Mori does not disclose transmitting a part or all of the electronic money data to the electronic money issuer for determining whether the amount of the issued electronic money data is valid. Accordingly, Mori does not remedy the deficiencies of Berson and Aiyama.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner asserts that "it is known to associate transaction data and validation data via a code."

Applicants believe that such allegedly known features are not found in the cited references, and request that the Examiner provide specific citations in the

reference and explain in particularity where and how the features recited in claim 15 are disclosed, if the rejection is maintained.

In view of the foregoing, claim 15 is patentable. Claim 20 is patentable at least because of its dependency from claim 15.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested and such action is earnestly solicited.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned so that prosecution of present application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: April 16, 2010

By: Weiwei Y. Stiltner
Weiwei Y. Stiltner
Registration No. 62979

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620